REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 5, 8 and 9 are amended. Claims 1, 4 and 5 are independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Amendment

Claim 5 is amended for form and claims 8 and 9 are amended for consistency. Thus, no new matter is added.

II. Rejection Under §101

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 5 is amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) over WO 2004/019607 to Aoyama et al. (Aoyama); and rejects claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,565,004 to Hashimoto. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 5 recite, *inter alia*, "a whole image region containing image data after a projection transformation is partitioned into a plurality of regions by partitioning lines in a horizontal direction and a vertical direction in order to carry out a projection transformation in each of the regions." Independent claim 4 recites similar subject matter. The applied references fail to teach or to have rendered obvious the recited features of independent claims 1, 4 and 5.

A. Aoyama

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is improper because Aoyama is not prior art. Aoyama is a PCT application published on March 4, 2004. On the other hand, Japanese priority document JP-A-2003-369157 was filed on October 29, 2003. The present application is an accurate English-language translation of the priority document. A claim of priority was

filed on April 28, 2006. Certified priority documents were submitted on April 25, 2006. Aoyama, therefore, is not prior art. Accordingly, the §102(a) rejection over Aoyama is improper.

B. Hashimoto

The Office Action relies on Fig. 6 and col. 1, lines 6-9 of Hashimoto for corresponding with the recited partitioned regions of a projection transformation. However, Hashimoto does not disclose partitioning a projection transformation and instead discloses the partitioning of an image grid overlaid onto a canonical coordinate system. See Fig. 6 and col. 9, lines 59 and 60 of Hashimoto. Accordingly, Hashimoto fails to teach, or to have rendered obvious, a whole image region containing image data after a projection transformation is partitioned into a plurality of regions by partitioning lines in a horizontal direction and a vertical direction in order to carry out a projection transformation in each of the regions. Accordingly, Hashimoto fails to teach, or to have rendered obvious, the recited features of independent claims 1, 4 and 5.

* * * * *

The dependent claims are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claims 1, 4 and 5 and for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Obert H. Chu
Registration No. 52,744

MAC:OHC/kjb

Date: September 14, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461